Applicant amended the claims to specify that the claimed game is an "adventure" game. It was submitted that none of the art cited by the Examiner relates to adventure games as that term is known and used in the art and defined in the specification. It was further submitted that any combination of the video maze game, golf simulator, and pin ball or other ball game cited by the Examiner does not teach or suggest the invention as presently claimed, and any combination of the cited art with adventure game art would be an improper hindsight combination.

The Examiner has responded by stating that "this limitation is notoriously obvious since maze games or competitive games could be considered as adventure games". The Examiner has not provided any evidence to support this statement. The Examiner cannot assume that the prior art teaches something when it is not clearly shown in the prior art. See, Ex parte Wolters and Kuypers, 214 U.S.P.Q. 735 (Bd.App. 1979) (Examiner's burden of supporting his holding of unpatentability is not met by "assuming" the presence of a missing component). Pursuant to MPEP §2144.03, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner cite a reference which teaches that "maze games or competitive games could be considered as adventure games".

To the contrary, the term "adventure game" has a well established meaning for nearly thirty years. Adventure games are also referred to as "interactive fiction" games. The hallmark of an adventure game is that it is based on a story. Another common

feature of an adventure game is that the player must solve puzzles to advance the story. Maze games and sports simulators are clearly NOT adventure games as that term is well known in the art. Attached hereto, for the Examiner's convenience, are articles from the worldwide web concerning the nature and meaning of "adventure games". These papers directly contradict the Examiner's statement that "maze games or competitive games could be considered as adventure games".

It is therefore submitted that any combination of the video maze game, golf simulator, and pin ball or other ball game cited by the Examiner does not teach or suggest the invention as presently claimed, and any combination of the cited art with adventure game art would be an improper hindsight combination.

It should also be noted that the Examiner's supervisor agreed that the claims were patentable (without the "adventure game" limitation) over Logg and Naka et al. See paper #4. The new art cited by the Examiner subsequent to paper #4 relates to a pinball game and a golf simulator. Neither of these references relate in any way to adventure games and there is no suggestion in the art that features from a golf simulator or a pinball game could or should be incorporated in an adventure game.

In light of the above, it is submitted that all claims are in condition for allowance. If, for any reason, the Examiner believes that the claims are not all in condition for allowance,

she is requested to call the undersigned attorney of record to discuss what possible amendments she might deem necessary to place the case in condition for allowance, at it is clear that the disclosed invention is considerably different than any of the cited art taken alone or together.

Respectfully submitted,

David P. Gordon
Reg. #29,996
Attorney for Applicant(s)

65 Woods End Road
Stamford, CT 06905
(203) 329-1160

August 10, 2001